IN THE SUPREME COURT FOR THE STATE OF ARIZONA

KARI LAKE

Plaintiff/Appellant,

v.

KATIE HOBBS, et al.,

Defendants/Appellees.

No. CV-23-0046-PR

Court of Appeals Division One

No. 1 CA-CV 22-0779 No. 1 CA-SA 22-0237 (CONSOLIDATED)

Maricopa County Superior Court

No. CV2022-095403

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF OF DAVID MAST IN SUPPORT OF KARI LAKE'S PETITION FOR SPECIAL ACTION

REFRIENCED FROM

Ryan L. Heath, Esq. (036276) HEATH LAW, PLLC 4022 E. Greenway Road, Suite 11 - 106 Phoenix, AZ 85032 (480) 432-0208 rheathesq@proton.me

Alexander Haberbush, Esq.* (CA SBN 330368) LEX REX INSTITUTE 444 West Ocean Boulevard, Suite 1403 Long Beach, CA 90802 Telephone No. (562) 435-9062 E-Mail: AHaberbush@LexRex.org *Pro hac vice motion to be filed Pursuant to Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. 16 and this Court's inherent authority, proposed amicus David Mast hereby moves for leave to file the attached brief, amicus curiae, in support of Appellant Kari Lake. Mr. Mast has read the attached proposed brief. The attached brief has been sponsored and paid for by Mr. Mast.

Ms. Lake has consented to the filing. On March 7, 2023, counsel for Appellees were asked, via email, to provide their position regarding whether they would consent to the filing. Attorneys for Appellee Katie Hobbs, for Defendant Secretary of State, and Maricopa County Defendants have all responded indicating that they would not consent to this filing.

Mr. Mast is a voter in Maricopa County and a registered Independent. His interests are in presenting the point of view of ordinary voters, as well as Arizonans who are not members of either party, concerning the problems with election administration that occurred during the November 2022 general election.

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Absent consent of the Parties an appellate court may allow an amicus curiae brief if the party "can provide information, perspective, or argument that can help the appellate court beyond the help that the parties' lawyers provide." Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. 16(b)(1)(c)(iii).

The contentious nature of this bipartisan dispute, wherein public officials from the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors have a personal liability interest in minimizing the many problems that occurred on their watch, threatens to erase interests of ordinary Arizona voters and, specifically, non-partisan Independents like Mr. Mast—a group of registered voters that

constitutes the second largest in the State of Arizona behind the Republican party.¹ Should Mr. Mast be permitted to appear as amicus, he shall advocate for a common-sense outcome, based on indisputable facts, that promotes the rule of law in the State of Arizona.

Firstly, Mr. Mast will argue that Ms. Lake's challenge to Maricopa County's signature verification procedures was timely pled because she is challenging undisputed acts of misconduct that occurred during the voting process, as opposed to alleged acts of misconduct that occurred before votes were cast, so her claim is substantive as a matter of law.

Second, Mr. Mast will argue that Maricopa County's failure to do logic and accuracy testing, Election Day irregularities, defects in chain of custody, and failure to properly verify signatures constitutes "misconduct" on the part of Maricopa County Officials.

Mr. Mast will also argue that, under Arizona's clear "uncertainty" standard, each of the uncontested acts of misconduct by Maricopa County Officials, even if considered alone, compel this Court to set aside the gubernatorial election results from Maricopa County as a matter of law.

Mr. Mast will next assert that Election Day irregularities exacerbated the extent of uncertainty caused by Maricopa County Official's handling of mail-in-ballots, which further supports the basis for setting aside of the gubernatorial election results from Maricopa County as a matter of law.

¹ See Ariz. Secretary of State, Voter Registration Statistics – November 2022 (General Election) https://azsos.gov/elections/results-data/voter-registration-statistics (Last accessed March 9, 2023).

Finally, Mr. Mast will argue that, irrespective of whether the alleged acts of misconduct by Maricopa County are deemed "non-technical," this Court should nevertheless rule in favor of Ms. Lake because Maricopa County's handling of the 2022 general election violated her clearly established fundamental rights as a voter, secured by both the Arizona and United States Constitutions.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Mast, as an Independent and ordinary voter, can provide perspective that the politicians litigating this case cannot. Because of his unique interests, Mr. Mast has an incentive to more fully develop the arguments to which the parties, their counsel, and the courts gave limited treatment below. For these reasons, this court should grant him leave to file the attached amicus brief pursuant to Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. 16(b)(1)(c)(iii).

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

Pursuant to Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. 4 and 6, I certify that the attached brief uses 14-point font in Times New Roman, is double-spaced, and contains approximately 8,422 words.

Dated March 16, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Ryan L. Health
Ryan L. Heath
HEATH LAW, PLLC
4022 E. Greenway Road, Suite 11 - 106
Phoenix, AZ 85032
(480) 432-0208
rheathesq@proton.me

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. 6, the undersigned hereby certifies that the attached Motion, the accompanying Brief, and all relevant attachments mentioned therein were electronically served on the parties via TurboCourt on March 16, 2023.

Dated March 16, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Ryan L. Health

Ryan L. Heath

HEATH LAW, PLLC

4022 E. Greenway Road, Suite 11 - 106

Phoenix, AZ 85032

(480) 432-0208

rheathesq@proton.me